DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 616 HE 005 731

AUTHOR	McLean, Sandi, Ed.
TITLE	The Changing Role of the College Presidency: Essays on Governance.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 74
NOTE	27p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, D. C. 20036 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; *Chief Administrators; Educational Coordination; Educational Finance; Essays; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Presidents

ABSTRACT

Four perspectives of the changing role of the college presidency, given at the 1973 Summer Council of Presidents of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, are presented in this report. Various issues are discussed including the role of the president, educational finance, coordination, and governance. (MJM)

the changing role of the college presidency

ED 094616

essays on governance

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 005 721

american association of state colleges and universities

The Changing Role of the College Presidency

Essays on Governance

by

John T. Bernhard
President
Western Illinois University

William C. Friday
President
University of North Carolina

Garry D. Hays
Vice Chancellor
Minnesota State College System

Stanley O. Ikenberry
Senior Vice President
Pennsylvania State University

edited by **Sandi McLean**

published by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036. Copies available at $1.00.

April, 1974

Introduction

Where once the sole concern of the college president was the achievement and maintainance of an educational capability, that concern is now fragmented among: insuring the due process rights of students and faculty, complying with the legal requirements of federal affirmative action regulations and state labor act provisions, fulfilling the fiscal expectations posed by legislators and state budget offices, and expanding educational opportunity.

Nor do the president's governance concerns mesh into a unified responsibility. More frequently they represent conflicting goals as the constituencies of the college are transformed into competing interest groups.

The president's role in this tug of war can not be simply characterized. Only one statement may hold from campus to campus, and that is that the president is subject to pressures for power from the winners, as he is subject to consequences from the losers.

Additionally, as the president's scope of governance has expanded far beyond the original educational objectives, the president's ability to govern has been altered by the creation of agencies, boards and commissions entering the decision-making process at the state-wide level.

The question is not whether the new special interest relationships in colleges or the control assumed by state-wide bodies are, in themselves, detrimental to the college. The question is how these factors affect the role of the president and the quality of governance.

Such a question was the subject of the 1973 Summer Council of Presidents of the American Association of Colleges and Universities. The following papers, taken from presentations made to the state college and university presidents attending the Council, offer four different perspectives on the changing role of the college presidency.

John T. Bernhard
President
Western Illinois University

To speak of the president's role as it was just a decade ago is to delineate a situation which today seems centuries old. At one time, not too long ago, it seemed plausible to write a rational description of the college presidency and its duties. For example, note Lloyd Woodburne's rather formal outline:

"*The President*

a) Act as chief administrative head and arbiter of disagreement between subordinate officers.
b) Determine with academic vice-president the educational direction of the administration.
c) Have major responsibility for raising of funds and for legislative relations as a part of this function.
d) Have major responsibility for continuous improvement of public understanding with alumni groups and other organizations.
e) Be responsible for student activities."

Of course, so much between the lines was left unsaid. In an effort to reinforce this general outline with the "stuff of leadership," James Perkins expressed a growing concern about the college president's proper role:

"Someone must be concerned with the institution as a whole, the activities it supports, the public face it presents, and the private concerns with which it is occupied . . . He must be able to involve himself directly in the central academic business of the university, to exert educational leadership, to be an agent for both stability and change. He must be capable of institutional justice and personal compassion. He must not fear power or be afraid to exercise it, because he must know that power cannot be the direct concern of either student or teacher. He must always be sensitive to the difference between the process of management and the process of education, and he must understand that the former must always serve the latter."

These wise and well-measured words were uttered just before the roof fell in on Perkins and many others in higher education.

In keeping with the dry humor that happily is associated with many college administrators, Herman B. Wells, upon leaving his post at Indiana University, observed that a college president needed "the physical stamina of a Greek athlete, the cunning of a Machiavelli, the wisdom of a Solomon, the courage of a lion, and the stomach of a goat." In a different but typically nuts-and-bolts statement, uttered when he was being "Reaganized" out of Berkeley, Clark Kerr claimed that a president's job was to provide "sex for the students, football for the alumni, and parking for the faculty."

Today the college president is besieged by a growing number of aggravating

problems. The student turmoil of yore may have subsided, but the nagging chores of survival still gnaw at the president's spirit and strength. And this is a truly dreadful situation, because his academic leadership and intellectual vision are so desperately needed today.

After gloomily concluding that either he couldn't manage the University of Cincinnati, or it wasn't manageable at all, Warren Bennis proceeds to unfold the record of a typical day in his office:

> "Here's a note from a professor, complaining that his classroom temperature is down to 65; I suppose he expects me to grab a wrench and fix it. A student complains we won't give him course credit for acting as assistant to a city councilman. Another was unable to get into the student health center. The teacher at my child's day school is dissatisfied with her grades. A parent complains about four-letter words in a Philip Roth book being used in an English class. The track coach wants me to come over to see for myself how bad the track is. An alumnus couldn't get the football seat he wanted. Another wants a coach fired. A teacher just called to tell me the squash court was closed at 7 p.m., when he wanted to use it. And so it goes."

To inject a personal reference, Bennis's plight reminds me only too readily of some events I have waded through over the past few years, months, weeks and days:

Getting inaugurated as president, with a bomb threat, and a steam-line explosion occurring on the same happy day.

Firing the football coach and searching for a new one.

Finding an ombudsman to handle student complaints.

Arguing with the Governor about his plan to raise tuition by 85 per cent.

Debating with some faculty leaders on the merits of a new all-university governance system.

Resolving a student sit-in, which was organized to protest the Kent State tragedy, the Vietnam War, the "irrelevant" curriculum, and the existence of ROTC—all wrapped up in one package.

Assuring legislators that wild-eyed radicals had *not* taken over the campus.

Arguing with the staff of the State Board of Higher Education for an *adequate* operating budget.

Worrying about student enrollment and dormitory occupancy.

Ordering the student newspaper off campus.

Lobbying in Washington for more federal aid to education, and for an Amtrak train to serve our students.

Noting the impact of an Affirmative Action Program and wondering how to administer it equitably.

And the list could go on and on. Surely, every president could compile a similar account of urgent items which all presidents seem to face nowadays. The broad spectrum of problems is both fascinating and frustrating. No wonder Frederick Bolman has emphasized excellent mental health as the first requisite of a college president.

Obviously, the role of the college president is far from easy. But then again, what administrative leader has it easy nowadays? The college presidency of today is vastly different from what it was yesterday. Mario Savio, Vietnam, and the dollar squeeze, among many other elements, helped to bury forever the idyllic image of a president pondering "Il Penseroso" in his quiet study. Instead, we have today a noisy office filled with telephone rings and nagging petitioners. Yet, above all this hue and cry, the president must still keep his eye firmly on the *educational* mission of his institution. All else,

though annoying and time consuming, is really peripheral to the academic goals of the college.

What faces the college president tomorrow? Vastly more complex and uncertain challenges lie ahead, and reading tea leaves or looking through a frosty crystal ball can be anybody's guessing game. However, as I see it, the president faces a future fraught with both peril and exhilaration in which he must be prepared to match wits with at least three major issues of great moment, and of overlapping effect:

- the crisis of dollars
- the crisis of coordination
- the crisis of governance

Dollars

Almost all presidents probably are painfully aware of the "stringent seventies" by now, and also of the fact that in the future they will have to continue the bleak battle for adequate funding — with mixed success.

In the decade of the immediate past, rapid physical expansion was the major theme, springing from demands for new classrooms, laboratories, and living spaces for students on residential campuses. This frantic growth snowballed into an enormous capital investment for American higher education. To illustrate, at Western Illinois University in 1960, fall term registration was only 2,600; but this fall, the total probably will reach 14,000 students. A fantastic leap of over five hundred per cent. The decade of the sixties meant dynamic growth in space, student enrollment, and certainly in faculty and staff.

Now, as we plunge through the 1970's, the "crisis of dollars" has become one of the great challenges in the administration of higher education, exacerbated by the most heated inflationary cycle in recent American history.

The powerful surge of the sixties made it inevitable that eventually the public would ask probing questions about the operation of colleges throughout the land. With total enrollments tripling in size, and with overall state appropriations jumping from about $1.5 billion in 1960 to over $7 billion a decade later, higher education in America moved inexorably closer to the day of public reckoning: of weighing alleged benefits against actual costs. Regardless of which criterion employed, this phenomenal support was a substantial reflection of citizen confidence in higher education, a reflection of the nation's perception of its colleges as the collective fountainhead for all advances in learning and service. As an unhappy result, however, Americans came to expect more than these institutions could logically be expected to deliver. And, perhaps, educators helped to perpetrate these unrealistic expectations, thereby making disenchantment that much more bitter when the moment of truth arrived.

Now the harvest of fiscal reaction has come. There were troublesome signs on the horizon even before the seventies, but in 1970-71, seventeen states actually appropriated *less* per student than in the previous year, in terms of handling any increased enrollment. And the future picture is far from bright. The president must prepare to wrestle even more energetically with the future inflationary cycles of our economy. Perhaps "Phase 10" will be with us five years from now. The need for improved academic programs, salary boosts, and the inevitable price increases on commodities, services, and utilities will unfortunately always outrace the belated attempts of legislators and governors to catch up via adequate appropriations.

At the heart of our fiscal crisis is the question of public confidence. To put if frankly, how much will society trust college administrators in the future? Higher education

planners, legislators, and other public officials are becoming more frustrated than ever about the rising costs in tax dollars, the knotty difficulty of determining social productivity in an academic context, and the proper role of colleges in a future era of stabilizing or even declining enrollments.

Earl Cheit's study, aptly entitled *The New Depression in Higher Education*, discusses the matter of confidence.

> We would emphasize three aspects of the task of restoring confidence. First, the colleges and universities must have campuses that reveal themselves as being reasonably governable — this does not mean a placid campus, but it does mean a stable one.
>
> A second requirement for confidence is that the colleges and universities demonstrate that they are reasonably efficient in their internal operations.
>
> Thirdly, in our judgment, restored confidence will require convincing evidence that the activities of colleges and universities have a unifying set of purposes — purposes that the supporting public can understand and defer to.

It appears that presidents accurately must inform the public of their plight, of their institutional goals and objectives, and of the worthiness of the total academic venture. Such dynamic action would greatly help to recapture the public's trust in higher education.

Coordination

Evidence clearly indicates that the national floodtide toward coordination of higher education is running very strong; even to the level of outright centralization in some states. Of course, many sound arguments can be made in support of the coordination movement. These include a more prudent and equitable allocation of available resources, together with a more systematized elimination of unnecessary program duplication.

However, serious controversy arises over the proper scope of the coordination effort and its impact upon governing board authority and institutional autonomy. The state of Illinois presently finds itself in the throes of such controversy. Some of our fellow citizens accuse us of "crying wolf" when we voice our alarm about certain tendencies in coordination, yet, clearly there is real danger in terms of the precedents established year after year, in state after state.

Only a blind man can deny the possibility that soon each campus may actually be administered on a day-to-day basis from a central headquarters. Such a development is not inevitable, but the possibility definitely exists, and vigilance may be the price of our autonomy. Further, adding to the volatile mix, are the growing aspirations of private colleges and proprietary schools.

This is not to say that Western Illinois University or any other institution should function and plan independently; but the definition of institutional objectives becomes difficult, if not impossible, in the current babble of voices raised over the issue of coordination vs. centralization. In the near future, presidents must confront the hard questions dealing with the viability of statewide coordination, as recently posed by Logan Wilson.

> What kinds of decisions are best made by a local institution? By a governing board? By a coordinating body? How much of the traditional autonomy must be sacrificed in order to become more "accountable"?

To what extent, if any, does increased coordination of higher education inevitably lead to more political and less professional participation in the overall enterprise? Will the increased application of statewide coordination result in a more rational approach to the problems of higher education? What is the undesirable impact of coordination upon governing boards and individual institutions? How can such an impact be minimized?

Governance

Shared governance is an esteemed and time-honored tradition in American higher education. While lines of practical jurisdiction between trustees, administration, and faculty seldom have been neatly drawn, a substantial body of governance "common law" (based on experience and good will)has matured over the decades. In recent years, student participation has been added to the traditional mix, with tentative and inconclusive results, at least at this stage of history.

However, another more powerful governance factor now has erupted upon the scene — namely, collective bargaining or faculty unionism. It is a very grave thrust, carrying such unfathomable implications that we cannot possibly judge its final weight upon the scales of higher education.

It is quite possible that the current conditions of fiscal austerity, lack of public enthusiasm, and a discouraging professional pessimism (related to the changing academic marketplace), have caused more faculty members to think seriously about collective bargaining as a "way out." Economic anxiety, as the central core of the growing labor union movement in academe, will sustain this tension as we continue to struggle for "survival budgets" during the coming years.

Perhaps collective bargaining does represent the wave of the future for academicians, and thus we will have to adjust and live in accordance with new rules. However, there is the possibility that many faculty members are so anxious to grasp for what they hope is economic security that they will overlook some of the serious repercussions of such a move — particularly in relationship to the academic world as they have known it.

Faculty quite naturally will strive for the best of both worlds, the economic security offered by collective bargaining coupled with the traditional collegial role of shared governance; but such an ideal goal will be very difficult if not impossible to attain.

As suggested earlier, the move for collective bargaining on many of our campuses seems to arise in large measure from the serious and continuing funding problems of institutions. Faculty members have seen equipment and facilities deteriorate, their salaries fall behind the spiral of inflation, and they sense the potential danger of steady-state or declining enrollments. Even if there is no necessary correlation between collective bargaining and operating budgets, the pent-up frustrations experienced by some faculty have turned them toward collective bargaining as a possible "solution." While, of course, some faculty members are committed to collective bargaining for other reasons, the deepening anxiety over employment conditions is the chief catalyst spurring the present leaders of this movement.

Carr and Van Eyck recently have painted an uneasy role for the college president under collective bargaining:

> Collective bargaining may, even under the best circumstances, complicate the lives of presidents . . . and make their jobs more intolerable than many chief executives have found them to be in recent years. . . . Some presidents have accepted collective bargaining as an understandable and appropriate development in labor-management relations and institutional governance, and have managed to live

comfortably if not happily with the process. But no president we know is without apprehensions about the consequences of collective bargaining nor does any seem truly to enjoy his part in the ongoing business of bargaining."

Though too early to judge, collective bargaining actually paves the way for a substantial external intrusion into those internal matters once thought to be under the control of the institution and its board. Thus bargaining becomes simply another means of external control over higher education, particularly as part of the total price that must be paid to get more support from the public treasury.

Given all the dangerous pitfalls, frustrations, and uncertainties that loom ahead, why be a college president at all? This is not an easy question to answer, but the central core of any response must be that the president obtains great satisfaction simply from guiding his college—through turbulent days—to serve society in ways never contemplated before in history. He is of the pioneering tradition, and serves on the cutting edge of a humane enterprise to which he is deeply committed.

Without a doubt, the office of the presidency has suffered badly at times from grievous human error. But, the one great asset of the pragmatic American college president has been his willingness to redress the balance, to find answers to questions such as "what went wrong?", or "how do we adjust to the situation?", or "what improvements are needed?" The fact that presidents are willing to explore and discuss issues, to make plans for improved academic quality, with logic as well as passion, is great testimony to the inner strength and viability of American higher education. True, there may be a slip from the chosen path on occasion, but, for the most part, presidents stick to the last in the persevering struggle to advance the cause of higher education for all human beings.

In this regard, there is some courage and inspiration from Blaise Pascal's wisdom:

> "Man is but a reed, the most feeble thing in nature; but, he is a thinking reed. The entire universe need not arm itself to crush him. A vapour, a drop of water suffices to kill him . . . All our dignity, then, consists in thought. By it we must elevate ourselves, and not by space and time which we cannot fill. Let us endeavor, then, to think well; this is the principle of morality . . . By space the universe encompasses and swallows me up like an atom; by thought I comprehend the world."

References

Warren Bennis. "The University Leader," *Saturday Review*, December 9, 1972, p. 43.

Robert K. Carr and Daniel K. Van Eyck, *Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus*, American Council on Education, 1973, pp. 256-257.

Earl F. Cheit, *The New Depression in Higher Education*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1971, pp. 154-155.

Blaise Pascal, *Pensees*, Nos. 347-348, Random House, New York, 1941, p. 116.

James A. Perkins, *The University in Transition*, Princeton University Press, 1966, p. 57.

Logan Wilson, *Shaping American Education*, American Council on Education, 1972, pp. 53-54.

Lloyd S. Woodburne, *Principles of College and University Administration*, Stanford University Press, 1958, p. 8.

Dr. William C. Friday
President
University of North Carolina

In many states and in the Congress, there are forces who work for the study or re-examination of the structure of higher education and especially its planning processes, having concluded for various reasons that existing arrangements are no longer adequate. There are many reasons for this new emphasis, including accelerating costs, the growing demands for public service not heretofore rendered, enrollments and admissions policies, the recent history of campus unrest, and other factors that have led political and legislative figures to more direct involvement and participation in decision-making in higher education.

This is not as bad as some allege. The public and the elected political leadership should share the achievements, concerns and ambitions of higher education. It is important, however, that the distinction be made between being of the political process and being submerged in the political process. Only through the former can a viable program of public higher education be provided to supporting citizenry.

From recent efforts to restructure higher education in North Carolina, two important facts became clear. One, the reorganization or structural pattern that meets the needs and circumstances of a particular state and its traditions, programs and commitments of service will not necessarily be the pattern that is applicable in any other state. And two, in any experience within a state or in response to Congressional acts [such as the proposed 1202 commission requirements] one should not become so possessed of flow charts and job descriptions as to begin to believe that administrative structure is an end in itself. Administrative arrangements exist primarily to facilitate and to serve educational purposes and objectives.

If these points are kept clear, and if administrators can view themselves candidly and fully, it will be possible to provide the kind of imaginative and constructive academic leadership which presently is needed.

The developments now taking place in several states may be illustrated more specifically by a description of the North Carolina experience.

Legislative and gubernatorial concerns, expressed by concrete proposals, about the organization and functioning of higher education in North Carolina reach back for nearly two decades [BHE, 1955]. During the past ten or twelve years, specific actions relating to colleges and universities have been introduced in virtually every session of the General Assembly. There were a number of reasons for the dissatisfaction with the way things were: institutional lobbying; legislative infighting; the proliferation of institutions and programs with growing budgets at a time when demands for other public services were increasing; the absence of a long-range plan with effective allocation of functions to avoid duplication; and campus unrest were among the circumstances.

It was against this background that the 1971 General Assembly took its decisive ac-

tion. It discarded coordination as North Carolina had experienced it and established a system of governance in which responsibility would be accompanied by authority over the public senior institutions and their activities. The distinction between governance and coordination is the critical point in North Carolina's choice. The new law created a 32-member Board of Governors [legislators and their spouses cannot serve on it; neither can the Governor or fulltime state employees and their spouses], and merged the nine regional universities and the School of the Arts with the six campuses of the University of North Carolina. The Board of Governors, which took office on July 1, 1972, was given substantial powers, including the management of all sixteen campuses, the appointment of all senior administrative personnel and tenured faculty, long-range planning, budget preparation and control, determination of functions and programs of institutions, tuition setting and establishment of enrollment levels and assessment of the role of private institutions.

The bill provided for a local Board of Trustees for each of the sixteen campuses. This is a rather unique arrangement in higher education. To the statutory authority conferred upon the local boards there has been added authority delegated by the Board of Governors and this latter delegation already has exceeded by a substantial measure the initial authority conferred by statute on the local Boards of Trustees.

Formerly, individual institutions submitted their own budget requests to the General Assembly. Under the new law, the Board of Governors is required to submit a single, unified budget on behalf of all the institutions. Direct appropriations are made to the sixteen campuses for continuation of present activities, but appropriations for all other purposes, including enrollment growth, salary increases and capital improvements are made to the Board of Governors for allocation to the campuses. The appropriations to the Board of Governors are made in a lump sum, based on the Board-estimated priorities for the University.

According to the statutes, the General Assembly will elect at two-year intervals a class of eight members to the Board of Governors, making certain that membership included minorities, members of the minority political party and women. Of the thirteen members of the local Boards of Trustees, eight are named by the Board of Governors, four by the Governor, and the student body president serves ex officio.

Under the new law, all new degree programs and all new activities must be processed and authorized by the Board of Governors before an institution may proceed to implement them. The Board of Governors also has authority, after due consideration and notice, to discontinue programs deemed to be unproductive or duplicative.

In the thirteen months since the Board of Governors legally came into existence, it has exercised several facets of its administrative role.

To begin with, the membership of the Board took the oath of office, elected its officers, established temporary committees of its membership, appointed its senior administrative officers, held an important seminar with the membership of all local Boards of Trustees, visited each of the sixteen campuses under its jurisdiction, and had representatives study the organization of five other multicampus universities in the nation.

It approved the merger of the staffs of the former coordinating Board of Higher Education and the office of the president of the University of North Carolina, and filled other important staff positions.

The Board adopted a University Code setting forth its procedures and rules and the delegation of authority to the president and to each of the sixteen chancellors. The Code also specifies policies on tenure and academic freedom and codifies all other statutory provisions relating to the University.

Within the administrative structure of the University there was established the Ad-

ministrative Council, which is composed of the 16 chancellors and the senior staff of the General Administration. This major step was taken to insure the participation of each of the chancellors in the formulation of administrative policy and all other basic administrative decisions that must be made in the University. Faculty relationships and advice also were deemed highly essential to the new structure, which led to the creation of the Faculty Assembly with representation [numbering more than sixty members] duly elected from all campuses. This body now has its own structure, by-laws and officers. The student body presidents have been involved also on matters that are University-wide in import and application.

There has been established an Advisory Committee of presidents from the private colleges and universities of the state through which direct discussion and debate on matters of mutual concern is now provided.

With the cooperation of the chancellors, a moratorium was declared for the 1973-74 school year on the establishment of new programs and activities until an objective and comprehensive inventory of all present programs and services could be made. This inventory of all the campuses is nearing completion. This kind of broad evaluation is a necessary prior step to proper long-range planning, which the Board also initiated this year.

The most demanding task undertaken by the new Board and its officers during the year has been the development of an entirely new budgetary procedure involving all the campuses. A procedure which would assure that the new policy of delegated decision-making could be wisely and successfully established. The General Assembly is going to experiment with annual instead of biennial sessions, and the budget and its preparation will become a constant concern. It is worth noting here that the 1973 General Assembly, which received the University's first unified budget, left the priorities intact and observed both the letter and the spirit of the new law. This was the first time the General Assembly received a budget request that reflected the application of composite educational and professional judgment to the total responsibility of the state in higher education. The sixteen chancellors and their chief financial officers were involved in every step of the budget process. To have done otherwise would have proved fatal to the new structure. At every step of consequence, each chancellor was consulted and given the opportunity to state his own priorities within broad educational categories, and, in most instances, his wishes were respected. At all times, there was free and open exchange. The amount of time invested in the budget preparation, although great, was a wise investment because it resulted in a budget that all could support even though no one got everything he desired. This process resulted in general fund appropriations for capital improvements of over $65 million, and a five per cent salary increase fund included over $180 million in appropriations for the operating budget.

What of the changing roles of presidents or chancellors in the new system?

For a system so new, it is too early to venture absolute judgments or conclusions. Maybe there is truth in the allegation of one of the chancellors that the "sheer volume of work which crosses the desk of the administrator today is enormous. Aside from the day-to-day tasks of dealing with routine matters in one's office, the operating, consummating, communicating, elucidating, coordinating, creating and relating results sometimes in near collapse . . ." However, there are positive achievements to consider.

The new system will help insulate the chancellors as chief campus officials from inordinate political pressures and involvement. Chancellors do not have to spend the many hours in appearances before legislative committees heretofore required. They are especially invited to attend hearings, to participate in these hearings, and may be called upon for specific assignments during the legislative process. This year there was no pit-

ting of one campus against another that at times in the past spilled over into other issues – to the detriment of all the institutions and the state as a whole. The prior process of sixteen separate presentations also wearied members of the General Assembly [at least, they so stated], and weariness does not often lead to an informed decision. Once the system has been firmly established and its procedures understood, with particular emphasis on the division of responsibility and authority between local Boards of Trustees and the Board of Governors, political pressures at the local level should be reduced. The consequence is that the chancellor has more time to tend to the primary obligation he holds: the academic quality of the campus over which he presides. This is constructive because there will be an increasing demand for the institution to give full account of its stewardship.

The new system will broaden the perspectives of the chancellors and president because all are involved in the University's needs. As mentioned earlier, the Administrative Council is composed of the sixteen chancellors and the senior officers of the General Administration. The Council meets monthly with a regular agenda. At these meetings, all major policy matters are discussed and so are specific problems and issues, which may or may not be statewide in scope. Every officer has his say and the discussions are lively. The broad experience represented around the table has been valuable to all.

The consensus approach, with the chancellors playing principal roles in its development, places administrators who have substantial experience in universities in the proper role in deciding educational matters. This point cannot be overemphasized. There are numerous individuals and groups, not so well versed in university administration, who would willingly assume this role – should educators falter or exhibit indecision.

This procedure takes on particular meaning to institutions where long-range planning is concerned. It is reassuring to know that critical decisions regarding the future of institutions will be made initially by educators and that these decisions will not be made without full and open debate.

The axiom that "in unity there is strength" has taken on new meaning in North Carolina. In appearances before the legislative committees of the 1973 General Assembly one of the most effective of all procedures was the depiction that all the chief executives had debated issues, arrived at decisions, and appeared together as advocates of specific plans and objectives.

The key, then, is that this process insures decision-making by the chancellors and the president at the critical points in the institution's life: programs, planning, budget request and allocation and selection of faculty and administrators.

It should be said that the new system will put temporary burdens on the chancellors and the presidents. For example, the development of the long-range plan is going to require each campus to provide exhaustive information of various kind. To the busy chancellor, this can be irritating as reports and studies increase in number. But this is a necessary and essential chore, and must be undertaken in that light. Once the process is established through experience, annual or biennial review will keep long range planning updated.

It is a new structure. As in any new venture, trial-and-error will be involved. There is determination on the part of administrators that this be an open and accessible administrative structure that seeks not to expand rapidly and consume all about it; but rather to remain flexible and develop a qualitative and dynamic program of higher education for the state. There will be times of uncertainty. But, in my opinion, we have made a good beginning. One reason we have done so has been the dedication and cooperation of the chancellors, who have demonstrated a determination to make the

structure work. It will take three to five years of operating experience and several sessions of the General Assembly before a realistic judgment of its successes and failures may be made.

Administrative styles vary. Some presidents do not follow extensive consultation, endeavoring to control things themselves. But the day of the single, powerful figure has passed. In looking to the future, there is no structural arrangement that will sustain an institution or its administration if basic educational decisions are not faced and considered judgment rendered.

And there are across the country several important issues which must be faced. On governance, decisions must be reached regarding the internal politics of higher education and the role of faculty, students, trustees and other lay leaders in the administration of the institution. On finances, how shall higher education be supported as other social demands grow in importance. Integrally related to finances is how institutions can grow and avoid wasteful duplication while still striving for greater quality in their services to constituencies. Enrollment presents a paradoxical problem. Institutions must adjust to declining enrollments of traditional students, but, at the same time, they must prepare for an era of universal access, including a greater span of student age than previously experienced. Finally, these factors and others have created a crisis of confidence on campus and in relation to the campus, among faculty members and administrators, trustees and public officials with responsibility for higher education and the public at large.

These are not the only troubling problems. Our country is undergoing a pervasive experience as manifested by the cynicism and doubt and outrage expressed today. It seems that opposition is not to be met by open and free debate; it is to be destroyed by character assassination and intrigue. It appears that freedom of the campus, and the press and of the right of the public to know must be managed by a sometimes self-serving wisdom. And, personal moral standards somehow are not to apply if they interfere with achieving personal or corporate objectives.

The time has come to go on the offensive. There are many great and wonderful programs and services being rendered by the higher education community. Those fortunate to serve institutions of higher learning as administrators face the issues of internal organization, financing, enrollments, jobs and the elimination of discriminatory practices, when found to exist.

The issues will be met. But something more is expected if higher education is to gather about it the sustaining strength of public confidence. Because college and university administrators are officers holding a public trust, they must respond by standing for free and open debate without rancor, by standing for the full exercise of free and responsible expression, and they must assert the ancient and proven moral values of our society.

It is a major task. Higher education must be organized and administered in such a way as to insure its freedom, not only in its traditional academic endeavors, but in its freedom from pervasive external pressure in order to preserve and enhance its vitality and dynamic qualities as a servant of society. So much depends now upon how well we succeed in this mission.

Garry D. Hays
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Minnesota State College System

The changes which have occurred and the climate within which the present day chief executive of an educational institution or system works requires that boards give increased attention to ways of improving management of top level personnel. There are a number of reasons for policies and procedures that provide for periodic and professional review and assessment of the performance of executives on their campuses or in the system offices.

First, students and faculties—long subjected to evaluation—are likely to argue increasingly for more systematic scrutiny of top level executives, and demand that they have a voice in such a review process. In most institutions students have been given a voice in the evaluation of their professors and, in some instances, this participation has been extended to considerations of tenure or non-renewal for untenured faculty. As enrollments decline and programs are reduced, faculty demands for even more authority in the governance of the college or university will likely increase.

Within the Minnesota State College system the presidents and the chancellor believe that the kind of policy that was adopted, with the initiative coming from them rather than from students and faculty, preempts a situation where they might be placed on the defensive by demands for such evaluation. Formal evaluation is a part of almost all professional life, and for it to eventually reach college executives would seem to be almost an absolute certainty. This being the case, it would appear desirable for presidents and chancellors to take the lead rather than wait to be placed in a reactive posture.

Secondly, that well-worn word "accountability" is not likely to disappear from common usage. Legislatures and the public generally—no longer completely enamored with higher education—are likely to feel more comfortable with systems which indicate, through their procedures and policies, that they do take seriously the proposition that executives in educational institutions are, indeed, accountable.

Thirdly, well developed policies and procedures are more likely to provide for the orderly change of presidents or chancellors and to permit avoidance of disruptive confrontations which can be embarrassing, and perhaps even damaging, to both the executives and the boards.

The subject is not related solely to decisions of competence and incompetence as factors in personnel changes. At a time of rapid pace and great change, institutional developments may make a different management direction or style highly desirable. This should be possible without reflection upon a president's ability or competence.

Fourthly, and perhaps most importantly from the point of view of the chief executive, a good policy of top management personnel provides for the president a protection and a respect for individual dignity that he or she does not now have. This is, it seems to me, one of the most significant aspects of the Minnesota and New York policies.

Presidents are evaluated now. The difficulty is that frequently this assessment is done informally (even secretly in some cases), outside the context of a written policy, and in the absence of well-developed procedures. In such a setting the opportunity for capricious action and for whim is more likely to be present. The old practice of reappointing presidents without formal evaluation or, on the other hand, the sudden issuance of non-reappointment notice is a product of an earlier, less complicated and less sensitive society. Most systems and institutions now have rules and regulations that afford great procedural safeguards for students and faculty, and preserve their human dignity. There is no reason why presidents and chancellors should be regarded differently in these respects.

Fifthly, it is the feeling that such a policy as the Minnesota Board has adopted should be helpful in attracting and holding good presidents.

In a time characterized by shorter presidential terms, great personal pressures, complex problems, and exhausting schedules, the policy should offer the presidents a sense of security, protect them from capricious action, and ultimately permit them to move out of the presidency into some other position in the system when they have had enough.

The preparatory work behind the adoption of the policy is indicative of the self-confidence and cooperative spirit of the parties involved.

A draft of the policy was prepared in the chancellor's office and then discussed in the Administrative Council (the chancellor and the presidents). The presidents then made some suggestions for changes, these were incorporated, and the policy was unanimously adopted by the Board. There was no paranoia; no questions were raised among the presidents about who the chancellor was trying to get or which one he was trying to force out.

The Minnesota policy starts with the proposition that, instead of an annual appointment, presidents and the chancellor would be appointed to a five-year term, with annual salary adjustments, and would normally serve a maximum of two successive terms.

There are two possible exceptions. A presidential appointment may be terminated at any time when, in the judgement of the chancellor and the Board, such action is in the best interest of the college and of the system. However, after such termination the president in his or her first term will receive five months salary, and a president in a second term shall continue to receive salary for nine months. During this period the duties of a former president shall be assigned by the Board upon recommendation of the chancellor. Secondly, an exception to the two-term maximum is possible when, upon recommendation of the chancellor, the Board determines that an appointment beyond the second five-year term would be in the best interest of a particular college and of the system. In such an event, a president's term would then be extended on an annual basis.

The evaluation portion of the policy provides that each president shall be evaluated during the third year of each five-year term and again during the first half of the fifth year.

It might be noted that this provision represents one of the significant changes suggested by the presidents; the initial draft called for only one evaluation during the fifth year. Some of the presidents argued for two evaluations.

The third-year evaluation shall include the use of consultants, external to the Minnesota State College System, who are experienced in various aspects of higher education (academic, fiscal, and student affairs), personnel management, and community relations; and opportunity for the consultants to interview representatives of the various campus components (students, faculty, administrators, and professional support staff) and members of the broader community.

It is not envisioned that the evaluation will include the same kind of campus involvement that occurs during a presidential search. The use of the phrase "opportunity for consultants to interview" is chosen carefully.

The report of the consultants will be made available to the president, the chancellor, and the Board. The president shall have the opportunity to respond to the chancellor concerning any matter contained in the report prior to the time the chancellor makes any recommendations to the Board.

During the fifth year there will be what is termed an adminstrative review, conducted by the chancellor. The review will take into consideration the third year evaluation and subsequent developments within a college and a president's administration. Again, the chancellor's report to the Board will be made available to the president prior to the time the chancellor makes any recommendations to the Board.

The presidents desired this more extensive, systematic third year evaluation in order to receive earlier in their term any criticisms of their college or their administration. They would then have time to initiate corrective action two years before the fifth year review. This seems to be good for both the president and the college.

Moreover, it should be remembered that this evaluation is not just of the president as an individual, but of the presidency: all aspects of the administration of a college. A review conducted by professionals external to the college will provide the president with an assessment of other officers in his or her administration. We view this to be an extremely important aspect of the procedure since it will provide an evaluation of vice presidents, their contributions and their shortcomings.

An important part of the Minnesota plan is the concept of the distinguished service professorship.

The purpose is to recognize the contributions which presidents and chancellors have made during their terms of office, and to insure that a college and the system as a whole may continue to profit from their accumulated experience and insights.

As noted earlier, increasingly presidents are choosing not to serve long periods of time—five to ten years will be sufficient for most. Assuming that a system is able to attract outstanding individuals, it is folly not to provide for a way to keep them after they no longer want to be president.

Moreover, faculty attitudes are not always conducive to a president moving into a department. This is perhaps more true for the president who is brought into the institution rather than one who is moved into administration and ultimately the presidency from a faculty position. Even in the latter case, however, there can be difficulty when departments are being cut back. Faculty members can resent what they view as the "dumping" of even a popular president into their department, perhaps subsequently causing a younger faculty member to be non-renewed.

Additionally, it is not unusual that after only a few years in the presidency an individual can quickly lose his or her academic grip on a discipline and may feel uncomfortable returning to an earlier teaching field. In such cases, particularly with decreasing enrollments and the resulting scarcity of jobs, an ex-president may not find a faculty position in another system as easily as in previous times.

Even if a good faculty position is obtained, there are frequently problems of retirement benefits. A president may find that by moving from one state to another to assume a presidency and even serving ten years, he has not built much retirement income. If he then must move to still another state, there is little opportunity to improve retirement benefits.

The distinguished service professorship is designed to respond to these considerations.

A president is eligible for a distinguished service professorship after serving at least five years as a president of a Minnesota State College and after receiving, upon recommendation of the chancellor, the approval of the Board.

The distinguished service professor's specific assignment shall be determined by the Chancellor in consultation with the individual involved. Should the distinguished service professorship involve a specific college, the new president of the institution also will be consulted.

Thus, there is a desirable flexibility. In one situation a president may wish to remain in the same college and may move back into his or her previous teaching discipline. In another case, it may be the president's desire to leave that campus and serve in some capacity in another institution or in some system assignment.

The salary of a distinguished service professor is established by the Board upon recommendation of the chancellor, but shall not be less than 80 per cent of the salary received during the last year prior to appointment as distinguished service professor.

Following appointment as a distinguished service professor, an individual shall be eligible for salary increases at least equal to those increments granted to meet adjustments in the cost of living.

Moreover, a distinguished service professor holding an appointment in a college shall have assigned to him or her by the college such graduate or undergraduate research assistants and/or secretarial assistance as will contribute to his or her effectiveness as a distinguished service professor. Additionally, a distinguished service professor shall be provided a suitable office, appropriately furnished, and shall be assigned a travel budget commensurate with his or her responsibilities.

In order to provide opportunity for a distinguished service professor to prepare for new duties, such professor is eligible for a sabbatical leave at full pay during the first full quarter of the appointment.

The Minnesota Executive Management Plan is, for the most part, new. Since 1970 the Minnesota State College Board has had the distinguished service professorship, although it was significantly modified and its provisions made more liberal with its inclusion in the over-all executive management plan in May, 1973. The other parts of the plan yet are to be implemented and modification undoubtedly will be made in view of subsequent experience. Early indications are that there is great interest around the country in the concept. However, as Chancellor Theodore Mitau has noted in a manuscript about the Minnesota plan, "To have helped in the launching of the dialogue offers no assurances that the eventual outcome of such deliberations will either do honor to its participants or that it will indeed lead toward organizational patterns that would in fact embody the alleged and hoped for virtues envisioned by their protagonists."

With appropriate caution stemming from limited experience at this point, there is, nevertheless, optimism that this policy will be beneficial to the colleges as well as to the presidents and to the chancellor of the system.

Stanley O. Ikenberry
Senior Vice President
University Development and Relations
Pennsylvania State University

Frederick Rudolph, noted higher education historian, has observed that the American colleges and universities have been marked by drift, reluctant accomodation, and a belated recognition that while no one was looking, change had in fact taken place. Change has, in fact, taken place in the governance of higher education and, in turn, it has brought about a significant change in the role of the president.

Students, faculty members, and administrators are regarded as the main governance components in higher education. The roles of each, however, are presently in a state of flux and, strangely, each appears to be in what might be considered a period of declining influence. John Corson put it bluntly when he observed:

> The great issue in the governance of higher education in the 1970s is not the struggle over who has the power on the campus . . . . The great issue is how the individual college or university can retain the power needed for effective governance, while government groups . . . expand their controls in the name of coordination, economy, and individual rights.

Had Corson taken a broader view of the external forces, he might have been even more emphatic in his statement. Governance can no longer be viewed primarily from an institutional perspective. More and more, higher education is governed by external forces, including not only higher boards, councils, and coordinating mechanisms, but the courts, agencies of state and federal goverment, labor relations boards and negotiated agreements, demographic forces, public policy-based financial incentives, student and faculty market forces, societal attitudes and financial realities. The cumulative impact of these forces has brought about changes in the roles and autonomy of the traditional institutional governance constituencies. Ultimately, external forces may change what we now think of as the American college or university.

State Coordinating Boards

Nearly every public college or university is now part of a larger system of higher education. The existence of state coordinating boards, consolidated governing boards and other centralized coordinating and control mechanisms reflects the dramatic growth of public higher education and the sharp increase in the role and responsibility of state governments in higher education.

The goals for which centralized mechanisms of control and coordination have been created are familiar: to channel limited resources; eliminate unnecessary and costly duplication; promote efficiency and effectiveness; insure full educational opportunity; and stimulate statewide and institutional planning and development.

However, questions are being raised with increasing frequency regarding the appropriate balance between the public interest and institutional autonomy. The Newman Commission suggested that statewide systems were stifling local initiative. The Commission wrote: "Presidents and board members often find themselves in the roles of public defenders of their points of view and/or apologists for campus incidents. Political safety, rather than educational leadership, becomes the priority."

Similar reservations were expressed in two separate Carnegie Commission reports in which it was noted that centralized coordinating and control mechanisms too often have been heavy handed in their distinction between public control and public influence.

Lyman A. Glenny has observed that statewide coordinating boards seek a legitimate role between the institutional governing boards and the executive and legislative arms of state government without being an advocate for either. In theory, he suggests, the statewide board promotes or mediates the "public interest," assuming it to be "Neither the collective aspirations and goals of the institutions nor the political desires of the governor or legislature." But in practice, this balance has been difficult to maintain. The too frequent result has been to bring college and university governance closer to the partisan political process.

The fundamental issue is centered around the distinction between coordination and control. As the pressures for coordination mounted during the late 1960s and early 1970s, and as greater powers were given to coordinating boards, there was both the temptation and the expectation for increased governmental control. Recently there has been a marked shift toward consolidated governing boards, such as in Louisiana, North Carolina, and West Virginia. The Governor of Wisconsin was instrumental in the establishment of a super system for the state. Twenty-two states now have consolidated governing boards, a 10 percent increase in this type of control since 1965. In many states, such as Pennsylvania, the powers of the central board have been strengthened. The tendency in each case has been to move further in the direction of governance and operational control.

The threat of external management control of public higher education by state governments has intensified during the past decade. Private institutions, to the extent they receive public monies—indirectly through student scholarships or directly through institutional grants—are fast becoming a part of the larger system.

Other State Government Agencies

The relationships of state government to public institutions are not new. Budget offices in some states have exercised such stringent controls on line item institutional expenditures that they have served effectively as the governing agency. Legislatures, always prominent, have become increasingly active. For example, the Pennsylvania Legislature introduced an amendment to the Pitt, Temple and Penn State appropriation bills that would have reduced the appropriation proportionately for that fraction of the faculty teaching less than 12-credit hours. Had the measure passed, it would have effectively legislated not only management decisions regarding workload and teaching methods, but institutional mission and character as well. When taken in conjunction with the impact of the governor's office, state scholarship and loan agencies, unemployment compensation commissions, civic service systems, state authorities for capital construction, centralized purchasing, statewide PPSB efforts, attorney general and auditors offices, and other state offices and agencies, the significance of the institutionally based governance mechanisms can appear meager indeed.

The Law

Perhaps the most rapidly increasing external force influencing institutional governance is the law. Law affects the total environment within which the colleges and universities operate, including fundamental institutional powers and the corporate structure. Relationships with state and federal governments are shaped through legislation. The interpretation of the law through the courts affects the nature of institutional authority and the relationships it maintains with students, faculty, and staff. The law and the courts have become increasingly active and crucial in the scheme of institutional governance. Byse has described visions of "a legal octopus about to strangle the academic community with its tentacles of insensitivity, conflict, obtuseness, technicality, wrangling, inflexibility, expense, and delay."

A growing number of students resort to the courts in questions of admissions, dismissal, and tuition and fees. Students have sought court orders to reopen campuses closed by civil disorders and faculty strikes. The United States Supreme Court, for example, has considered within the past year cases relating to faculty tenure, the constitutional rights of student organizations to obtain campus recognition, and out-of-state tuition.

In a two to one opinion handed down in June, 1973, a United States Court of the Western District of Washington ruled that Washington State statutes imposing a one-year durational requirement for residency status for tuition purposes in the state's public colleges and universities were not unconstitutional. A prior ruling by the United States Supreme Court, however, struck down a Connecticut statute that barred out-of-state students from ever qualifying for in-state classification so long as they remained students in the state system of public higher education. At the same time, the court found, much to the relief of many a college financial officer, no objection to "a reasonable duration residence requirement." Of note is not the substance or appropriateness of these decisions, but the fact that all were made external to the college campus.

The attack on companies selling term papers to college students for use in satisfying their academic assignments is also being fought through legislative and judicial action. At the urging of college administrators, legislation has been passed in California, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other states. While the cries that "there should be a law" are perfectly understandable, such moves represent a further involvement of external forces in the conduct of internal academic affairs.

Certain laws and judicial decisions get translated into the state and federal bureaucracy, and as such, are transformed into still other external forces. Officials of the Department of Labor, concerned with the enforcement of the federal Equal Pay Act for faculty members and professional employees of colleges and universities, asked that they be sent information on academic personnel policies to help guide their deliberations. Not surprisingly, some administrators expressed concern about how the concept of merit will fare under the Equal Pay Act, how market differences can be accounted for; and how the law can be obeyed and still allow faculty members to render judgments on their colleagues.

No college or university can be above the law. The record of institutional response to needed change, in the absense of legal or other external pressure, is not impressive. Work toward equal opportunity for women and minorities was brought about by the force of the Affirmative Action effort of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The traditional academic employment patterns utilizing the informal (and often discriminating) colleague network have been modified in most colleges and universities largely through the intervention of external forces.

The net effect has been a formalization of academic processes. O'Neil claims that the American university has already become, in its administrative aspects, a quasi-judicial institution." Campuses are preoccupied with legal due process and rules of procedures and appeals. We have become super conscious of the force of the law and the judiciary on institutional decision making. The result has been what some have called the judicialization of the university.

A recent Carnegie Commission report goes to the heart of the issue. The obvious drawbacks in resorting to the courts are the expense, the strain on personal relationships, the delays, and the insensitivity of courts to academic issues. But there are other more subtle costs: the abrogation of independent university judgment either by not making a decision at all and thus avoiding a challenge, or by passing the buck to the courts for final decision; the substitution of a strictly legal or constitutional decision for a desirable or wise one; and "creeping legalism," that is, the transformation of educational decisions into "judicial" decisions.

Collective Bargaining

A growing external force in institutional governance, and one with profound implications, is collective bargaining. In many ways, it is a subissue of the legal developments discussed earlier, because collective bargaining rights in the public sector are based on enabling legislation at the state level, and the process typically is governed by the state labor relations board. However, collective bargaining promises to have such a governance impact that it is deserving of special consideration.

Collective bargaining is still new enough to constitute a major unknown. In many respects, collective bargaining in American higher education is still relatively limited, restricted to fewer than half the states in the union, and comprising only approximately 25 per cent of all campuses. But there are those who believe that essentially all of public higher education will be involved in collective bargaining in time.

A major contributing factor to the rise of collective bargaining is the adoption of enabling labor legislation. Approximately 85 per cent of the campuses on which faculty are unionized are in states which have adopted comprehensive public sector labor legislation, including Delaware, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin. Once a mechanism to organize faculties is set up within a state, it is not difficult for it to make overtures to faculty members at several institutions.

As with so many of the legal developments confronting higher education, collective bargaining issues frequently are resolved through external processes and agencies. Unless there is mutual agreement between all parties regarding the definition of an appropriate faculty unit, for example, that crucial decision is resolved by the labor relations board. Unit determination decisions can have major governance implications. Should there be a single bargaining unit or separate units for each campus in a multi-campus system? Should part-time faculty members be included? Should nonteaching, support professionals be included in a faculty unit? Should segments of the faculty in specialized disciplines or professions be recognized as separate units? Are department chairmen or heads supervisory personnel who represent management, or spokesmen for their colleagues? At this time the alignment of the bargaining unit can have repercussions upon personnel procedures, faculty governance structures, and even curriculum development.

The introduction of faculty collective bargaining to a campus means that a whole new set of questions must be asked by colleges and universities. The most crucial of these is what is bargainable and under what circumstances will the final agreement be reached?

The philosophy and determination that faculty representatives and institutions bring to the bargaining table will ultimately answer the question as to what is bargainable. Two extremes are possible: one in which the scope of bargaining is held to a fairly narrow range of issues, such as salary and fringe benefits; and the other in which the scope of bargaining is broadened to include academic conventional governance mechanisms. To the extent that a comprehensive approach is taken, matters now largely in the hands of individual faculty members and their departments, such as the determination of teaching loads, decisions on appointments, promotions, tenure, and other decisions typically considered professional as well as managerial in character, will become subject to the terms of the contract. Managerial as well as faculty authority likely will become defined more sharply thus forcing a departure from traditional concepts of shared authority and reducing the opportunities for individual and departmental variation.

While collective bargaining may appear to strengthen both the hand of the faculty as well as that of the administration, it may at the same time diminish the independence of each. For example, in the 14 Pennsylvania State Colleges the state was declared the employer for the purposes of faculty bargaining, effectively removing the negotiations from the control of the local campus faculties and administrators. The merit of the decisions notwithstanding, the fact is that the decision point on a multitude of issues now resides outside the institutions.

The impact of collective bargaining on campus governance is likely to grow. It seems unlikely that negotiations will be focused primarily at the local campus when public institutions derive most of their support from tax monies appropriated by the state legislature. The eventual bargaining contract will have implications for the executive and legislative branches of state government. It is likely that state governments more and more will assume the role of management and play a key role in the contract negotiations. It is also likely that the union, sensing that the ultimate decisions must be made by the legislature and by the executive branch, will attempt to bypass campus administrators and boards and concentrate their negotiating efforts at the state level.

Students, sensing that their rights as consumers may be bargained away, may organize politically, further escalating the transfer of governance to external forces. The ultimate result may be a legalization of the university, defining by an externally negotiated contract all those issues that were not earlier predefined by law. In such a context, the law becomes the ultimate means of academic change. Politics and American colleges and universities may become intertwined in ways few either now foresee or desire.

Contextual Forces

The backdrop against which these shifts in governance must be viewed represents still another external force. Higher education has moved from an era of growth and rapidly expanding resources into an era of potential enrollment decline and financial stringency. National population trends indicate that for the first time in over 100 years, higher education enrollments among the 18- to 21-year old group will not increase during the ensuing decades. In many institutions, enrollments will decline. Financial resources which have expanded exponentially with enrollments in the past are not and will not keep pace with institutional needs. Demands upon the public dollar are growing in sectors other than education and a declining proportion of state funds will be committed to higher education.

Added to these contextual forces, it is probable that the employment demand for faculty members will continue to soften, and the connection between further education

and income will be increasingly tenuous for students.

These and other contextual forces will have a discernible impact on governance. In a period of scarcity of students, scarcity of faculty positions, and scarcity of financial resources, institutional change will become more difficult. The local governance scene may become even more conflict-ridden in the future than it has been in the past.

Implications for the President

What are the implications of these shifts in the governance initiative for the role of the college or university president? The growing significance of external forces on campus governance suggests at least five specific implications for the already difficult role of the president.

First, it is essential that the inherent powers of the presidency be reasserted and strengthened. The period of the 1960's saw an erosion of presidential influence. Other internal constituencies including students and faculty members began to play a much stronger role in internal decision making. In recent years, external centers of power became increasingly important. The role of the president in institutional governance became diluted to the point that some institutions became almost leaderless. Weak presidential authority can eventually weaken the institution as a whole and with it, undercut the academic freedoms of faculty members and students and make meaningless the role of the trustees.

To recommend a reassertion and strengthening of presidential powers should in no way be confused with long outmoded and ineffective styles of dictatorial and arbitrary presidential action. Any such attempt would effectively destroy the president's ability to lead. What is required is a reassertion and strengthening of the president's powers of educational leadership. He must play a role in the articulation of institutional priorities; play an active role in bringing about constructive educational change; and build the faith of those within the institution in his integrity.

Second, presidents must be increasingly conscious of the shifts in the cumulative balance of governance powers, particularly the shift in the balance away from the institution. Similarly, presidents need to increase the consciousness of others — both those on campus and those on the outside — to the implications of the decline in institutional independence. The best of man's experience over the centuries tells us that there are sound reasons for preserving a reasonable degree of independence of certain social functions and institutions from the control of the state. The independence of church and state has been a hard fought but cherished principle in America. A similar degree of independence is essential in the case of education, especially higher education.

Beyond this philosophical concern, which is of crucial importance in a democracy, there are practical reasons for safeguarding institutional independence. As John Corson has put it, "State and federal coordinators-controllers must be aware that a dynamic, innovative faculty can be reduced to the pulp of a time-serving bureaucracy by remote coordination." This in no way suggests a lack of need for effective statewide coordination of higher education. What is needed, however, is broad policy coordination, guidance in rational resource allocation, and long-range planning, not centralized management or governance control.

Third, college and university presidents should look to the outside and devote a greater portion of their time to external constituencies. As the influence of external agencies and forces on campus governance grows, an increasing share of the president's time and attention must be devoted in that direction. Clark Kerr has commented that, "The greatest current change in governance is not the rise of student or faculty power

but the rise of public power . . . " College and university administrators must relate effectively to those state and federal councils where higher education decisions are made. If the focus of decision-making is moving away from the campus toward political or governmental bodies, the integrity and welfare of the institution demands that the president become involved, interpreting the institution's position, and wherever possible, seizing the initiative to rebuild public confidence in the ability of the campus to serve the public interest.

Fourth, the president must take on the role of buffer, defender and translator. The cross currents of governance have grown increasingly turbulent. "Public interest works in the direction of public control, but student and faculty activism works in the direction of local control . . . faculty and student . . . sentiment is in favor of more self-governance, but the reduction in a sense of consensus among faculty members and students makes such self-governance difficult. The cessation of growth calls for more flexibility in making readjustments in past patterns of operation; but faculty collective bargaining organization may mean more rigidity and more attachment to the status quo. Financial stringency often requires more centralized control . . . but central control is also more suspect." (Governance of Higher Education)

It is obvious that the president is the man in the middle, relating directly to each of the internal and external governance constituencies. One of his most important roles is to be a buffer between the frequently contradictory pressures and to interpret and help resolve conflicting positions. As a buffer, every president should be blessed with a thick skin, remembering that the dictionary defines buffer as "something that lessens or absorbs the shock of an impact."

Fifth, if governance initiative is to be returned to the campus, the president must encourage campus constituencies to solve local problems locally. Certainly the greatest temptation during a period of escalating conflict is to assume a safe and sheltered position, letting the problem be resolved elsewhere, whether it be in the courts, a central coordinating board, the bargaining table, or the governor's office. The temptation is to abrogate responsibility.

Will campus faculties and administrators face the problems of retrenchment and reallocation through responsible program review efforts at the campus level, or will external intervention be necessary? Can internal governance mechanisms be strengthened, or will more and more faculty and student problems continue to be resolved by the courts? Will campus administrators insure effective inter-institutional cooperation and program coordination, or will heavier controls need be applied by the central coordinating board?

Presidents must help faculty members, students, and board members recognize that although it may be attractive and expedient to let certain problems be solved through appeals to external power sources, to do so weakens local autonomy and independence. Legislative, judicial or executive intervention may be welcomed with open arms on one issue, but viewed with alarm on others.

Obviously, higher education institutions must continue to function in the real world. Campus autonomy has never been absolute. Nor should it be. Essential institutional independence can be safeguarded only as colleges and universities begin to solve more of their problems on the campus.

Ultimately, it must be remembered that governance and the role played by the president are means toward a greater end. Governance and presidents are effective only as long as the efforts and processes translate themselves into more effective educational institutions, programs and services.

Both the substance and the spirit of the enterprise are at stake. The ultimate test of governance and the role of the president is whether the decisions reached enhance the quality and performance of higher education and the welfare of society. The process must also gain and retain the legitimacy and trust of those intimately involved—students, faculty members, staff, trustees, and alumni.

Never before has the opportunity for presidential leadership been greater.

Author's Note: The comments and assistance of Dr. Gregory Lozier of the Pennsylvania State University in developing and illustrating the various forms of external influence are gratefully acknowledged.

References

Clark Byse, "The University and Due Process: A Somewhat Different View," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 54, No. 2, 1968, p. 144.

Robert K. Carr and Daniel K. Van Eyck, *Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus*, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973, p. 74.

John J. Corson, "Institutional Governance Within a System," Educational Record, Vol. 54, No. 2, Spring, 1973, p. 107.

Lyman A. Glenny and Thomas K. Dalglish, "Higher Education and the Law," *The University as an Organization*, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw Hill, 1973, pp. 173-202.

Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw Hill, April, 1973, p. 10.

Clark Kerr, "Administration in an Era of Change and Conflict," *Educational Record*, Vol. 54, No. 1, Winter, 1973, pp. 38-46.

Report on Higher Education, (Frank Newman, Chairman), Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., March, 1971, p. 25.

Robert M. O'Neil, *The Courts, Government and Higher Education*, New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1972, p. 31.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Suite 700, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 293-7070

Allan W. Ostar
Executive Director